

01263.001195.



RECEIVED

FEB 24 2004 PATENT APPLICATION

TC 2600

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED

FEB 26 2004

TC 2600

In re Application of:)
: Examiner: S.H. Azarian
RICHARD IAN TAYLOR)
: Group Art Unit: 2625
Application No.: 09/519,666)
:
Filed: March 6, 2000)
:
For: IMAGE PROCESSING APPARATUS) February 23, 2004

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED

FEB 25 2004

Technology Center 2600

STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE
FEBRUARY 11, 2004 TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

Sir:

A telephone interview was conducted on February 11, 2004 in the above-identified application, between the Examiner and an attorney for the Applicant (Fritz Klantschi, Reg. No. 50,333). This Statement includes the substance of the interview and should be considered as a separate record of the substance of the interview.

During the interview, Applicant's attorney discussed the Office Action dated August 8, 2003, the Supplemental Amendment dated January 8, 2004, the Amendment After Final Action dated November 5, 2003, and the prior art, *Robert* and *Everett*. Applicant's attorney distinguished the prior art from the claims as follows.

The *Robert* system calculates the luminance values of pixels of a missing image from two known images, where the missing image occurs, relative to time, between a first known image and a second known image. The known images are taken from the same viewing position and direction as discerned from Equation 3 at column 6, lines 9-11, which calculates the velocity vector of each pixel, taking into account the difference in distance in both the X and Y directions as function of time. Equation 3, however, fails to take into consideration a change in direction or position, when calculating the velocity vector. Figure 2 provides a graphical representation of this, in that time (t) is the only variant between images Ta, Tj, Ti, and Tb.

Further, the registers depicted in Figure 14, and discussed at column 19, lines 43-53, do not equate to an image registering unit for registering the input images at different times, as suggested by the Office Action. Rather, registers 120-123 form part of the computing device 105 which calculates the luminance value (Equation 8, column 9, lines 62-69). Thus, registers 120-123 are not used for registering input images.

The *Everett* system relates to improved refracting astronomical telescope assemblies. As pointed out in the Amendment After Final Action dated November 5, 2003, the *Everett* system uses photocells to detect a shift in the sun's image to produce signals representing this shift which are applied to a motor drive to automatically position the telescope. Accordingly, the *Everett* system does not use recorded images, but rather processes the shift in the sun's image in real time. Accordingly, combining *Everett* with *Robert*, as suggested in the Office Action dated August 8, 2003, would defeat the purpose of *Robert* and in fact teach away from the claimed invention.

The Examiner stated he would consider the arguments presented during the interview and those presented in the Amendment After Final Action. The Examiner also suggested that the Applicant consider amending the independent claims to include the features of dependent Claim 15, but would not guarantee that such an amendment would place the application in condition for allowance.

Applicant respectfully submits that this Statement is a complete record of the substance of the telephone interview conducted on February 11, 2004.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 50,333

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200